

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 were pending in this application. According to the December 9, 2005 Final Rejection, claims 1-9 were rejected and claim 10 was withdrawn from consideration. Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, and 7. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are under consideration. Applicant maintains that the amendments do not introduce any new matter.

Applicant respectfully requests this amendment be entered as it raises no new issues, and will place the application in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner is not persuaded that the application is now in condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests this amendment be entered to place the application in better condition for appeal.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification at the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 10 and in particular, indicated that reference numeral “906” should be reference numeral “954” for consistency with the drawings. In response to the Examiner’s objection, applicant has amended this paragraph as indicated by the Examiner.

The Examiner also objected to applicant’s amendment filed on June 20, 2005 and in particular, indicated that applicant amended the specification at the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 30 but that applicant incorrectly instructed that the amended paragraph replace the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 25. Accordingly, applicant has amended the specification at the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 25 to place this paragraph back to its proper form. Note that the amended paragraph addresses the Examiner’s objections noted in the Office Action of December 16, 2004 regarding the incorrect reference numerals. Applicant has also amended the specification at the paragraph beginning on page 13, line 30 to address the Examiner’s objections noted in the Office Action of December 16, 2004 regarding the incorrect reference numerals. Applicant has also amended this paragraph to correct a typographical error.

Objection to Claim 5

In response to the Examiner’s objection to dependent claim 5 at line 7, applicant has amended this claim to replace the word “small” with “smaller.”

Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-9 in view of Monaco

The Examiner rejected previously presented claims 1-4 and 7-9 as unpatentable, 35 U.S.C. 102(b), in view of Monaco, U.S. patent 5,881,582 (hereinafter Monaco). Beginning with independent claim 1, the Examiner indicated that Monaco teaches through device 10 a lock assembly as recited by claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 recites in part, a laptop lock assembly comprising:

a lock body ...;
a cable plug slidably coupled to the lock body ...; [and]
a cable attached to the cable plug

In the Office Action, the Examiner equated sleeve 14, lock body 12, and cable 80 of Monaco device 10 to the lock body, cable plug, and cable, respectively, of the lock assembly of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to claim 1, Monaco does not teach or suggest that cable 80 is “attached” to lock body 12. Specifically, as described in the specification and as shown in Figures 1 and 2 of the application, the word “attached” as recited by claim 1 clearly means that the cable is integral with and non-detachable from the cable plug. As shown in Monaco Figure 10, cable 80 can be inserted into and removed from aperture 20 and slot 18 of lock body 12. Accordingly, cable 80 is clearly not “attached to” lock body 12 and as such, Monaco does not teach claim 1.

Nonetheless, to expedite prosecution of this application, applicant has amended claim 1 to make explicit that which was implicit. Specifically, applicant has amended claim 1 to further recite,

wherein the cable and cable plug are such that the cable is non-detachable from the cable plug whether the laptop lock assembly is in the locked state or the unlocked state.

Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to claim 1, Monaco does not teach or suggest that cable 80 is non-detachable from lock body 12 whether device 10 is in the locked state or the unlocked state. Specifically, as shown in Monaco Figure 10, when device 10 is in the unlocked state, cable 80 can be inserted into and removed from aperture 20 and slot 18 of lock body 12, as indicated above. It appears that cable 80 is only secured to device 10 once lock body 12 is slid into sleeve 14 to place device 10 into a locked state. Accordingly, while cable 80 may arguably

be non-detachable from lock body 12 when device 10 is the locked state, cable 80 is detachable from lock body 12 when device 10 is the unlocked state, contrary to claim 1. In addition, there is no suggestion or motivation to modify device 10 such that cable 80 is non-detachable from lock body 12. In particular, Monaco is specifically directed at a “multi-purpose” lockout device 10. (Monaco, column 1, lines 7-11 and column 1, lines 32-36). One lockout form uses cable 80 as described above. However, the other lockout form (as shown in Monaco Figure 1) does not require cable 80 and the cable is removed. Accordingly, applicant submits that making cable 80 non-detachable from lock body 12 would be contrary to the teachings of Monaco.

As such, applicant respectfully submits that Monaco does not teach or suggest claim 1, or dependent claims 2-4 and 7-9, which depend therefrom. Note that claim 7 has been amended for consistency with claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7 in view of McFarland

The Examiner rejected previously presented claims 1-4 and 7 as unpatentable, 35 U.S.C. 102(b), in view of McFarland, U.S. patent 2,931,607 (hereinafter McFarland). Beginning with independent claim 1, the Examiner indicated that McFarland teaches through the clamp shown in Figure 1 a lock assembly as recited by claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

McFarland is directed at a clamp for securing electrical wires and plumbing lines to a mounting bracket so that the wires and plumbing lines can be held out of the way. Specifically, as shown in McFarland Figure 1, the clamp includes sleeves 4, which are attached to mounting bracket 3, and a staple 1 having legs 9 and 13 that detachably insert through sleeves 4. Leg 9 of staple 1 includes a set of notches 10 that interact with a spring 6 attached to a sleeve 4, the interaction of notches 10 and spring 6 detachably holding staple 1 within the sleeves 4. As shown in Figure 1, the electrical wires and plumbing lines are supported by a U-shaped portion of staple 1 so as to be secured to mounting bracket 3 and held out of the way.

In the Office Action, the Examiner equated staple 1 and the electrical wires and plumbing lines of McFarland to the cable plug and cable of the lock assembly of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that contrary to claim 1, the electrical wires and plumbing lines of McFarland are not “attached to” staple 1. Specifically, as described above, the electrical wires and plumbing lines of McFarland are merely supported by staple 1 and are detachable from staple

1 once the clamp is opened. Accordingly, McFarland does not teach “a cable attached to the cable plug ... wherein the cable and cable plug are such that the cable is non-detachable from the cable plug whether the laptop lock assembly is in the locked state or the unlocked state,” contrary to claim 1.

In addition, the Examiner also equated spring 6 of McFarland to the lock of claim 1. Claim 1 recites a “lock ... configured to place the laptop lock assembly into a locked state.” Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not consider “spring” 6 to be a “lock” that can place the clamp of McFarland into a “locked state.” As described above, spring 6 is merely a mechanism for interacting with staple 1 to hold the staple within the sleeves 4.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that McFarland does not teach claim 1, or dependent claims 2-4 and 7, which depend therefrom.

Rejection of Claims 8 and 9 over McFarland in view of Monaco

The Examiner rejected previously presented claims 8 and 9 as unpatentable, 35 U.S.C. 103(a), over McFarland in view of Monaco. Claims 8 and 9 recite that the cable of claim 1 “includes a looped portion” and that “the cable includes a cable box configured to receive an end of the cable to form the looped portion of the cable.” The Examiner indicated that while McFarland does not teach a cable with a looped portion and cable box, it would be obvious in view of Monaco to modify the system of McFarland to include a looped portion and cable box. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, as indicated above, McFarland is directed a clamp for supporting electrical wires and plumbing lines, which wires and lines the Examiner equated to the cable of applicant’s invention. Applicant submits that there is no suggestion or motivation to form loops in electrical wires and plumbing lines, such loops providing no purpose and arguably being detrimental to the proper functioning of the electrical wires and plumbing lines. Accordingly, McFarland and Monaco fail to obviate claims 8 and 9.

Rejection of Claims 1-6 over Galant in view of Vezina

The Examiner rejected previously presented claims 1-6 as unpatentable, 35 U.S.C. 103(a), over Galant, U.S. patent 6,308,928 (hereinafter Galant) in view of Vezina et al., U.S. patent 6,298,695 (hereinafter Vezina). Beginning with independent claim 1, the Examiner indicated that Galant discloses a security device 10 for use with a laptop and that device 10 discloses all the limitations of the lock assembly recited by claim 1 except for the use of a cable. Here, the Examiner indicated that Vezina teaches a security apparatus 20 that includes a cable 99 and that it would be obvious to modify security device 10 of Galant to include a cable as taught by Vezina.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the combination of Galant and Vezina obviate claim 1 because there is no suggestion or motivation to add a cable to security device 10 of Galant. Specifically, Galant teaches a security device 10 that includes a lock device 18 and a securing member 12 having a leg 14. As shown in Galant Figures 2 and 3, securing member 12 seats over a laptop 22, with leg 14 extending through a desktop 28. Locking device 18 in turn mounts on the underside of desktop 28 to leg 14. In this fashion, security device 10 secures the laptop to desktop 28.

Applicant acknowledges that Vezina teaches the use of a cable 99 to secure a safety apparatus 20/computer equipment to a fixed object. In the Office Action the Examiner indicated that the motivation to combine this cable of Vezina to security device 10 of Galant is to “lock the laptop to a fixed structure, to prevent theft of the laptop, as is well known in the lock art.” However, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Galant already teaches a specific structure for securing a laptop to a fixed object (i.e., a desktop). Accordingly, the need for a cable is unnecessary and as such, there is no suggestion or motivation to add a cable to security device 10 of Galant.

As important, Galant specifically teaches that the use of “flexible cables to secure ... laptop computers ... offer limited security as the cables can often be cut relatively easily.” As such, “[t]here is a need for a ... device ... which provides an increased level of security over traditional cable devices.” (Galant, column 1, lines 18-25). Accordingly, applicant submits that Galant actually teaches away from the use of a cable with security device 10.

As such, for the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that Galant and Vezina fail to obviate claim 1, in addition to dependent claims 2-6, which depend therefrom.

Conclusion

Since Monaco, McFarland, Galant, and Vezina fail to teach or suggest applicant's invention as now set forth in amended claims 1-9, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Final Rejection, entry of this amendment, and favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9.

Applicant earnestly believes that this application is now in condition to be passed to issue, and such action is also respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner deems it would in any way facilitate the prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone applicant's counsel at the number given below.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on February 23, 2006:

Max Moskowitz

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

February 23, 2006

Date of Signature

MM:GRF/db

Respectfully submitted,

Max Moskowitz

Registration No.: 30,576

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700